

REMARKS

In the Office Action of April 28, 2010, claims 6, 7, 10-19, 22-31 and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,459,442 B1 (hereinafter "Edwards et al.") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,471,578 (hereinafter "Moran et al."). Furthermore, claims 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,184,885 B1 (hereinafter "DeStefano").

On August 9, 2010, a personal interview between the undersigned attorney and Examiner Andrea Natae Long was conducted. In the personal interview, the cited references of Edwards et al. and Moran et al. were discussed with respect to the independent claims 6, 18 and 30 and the dependent claims 14, 26 and 37. In addition, possible amendments to claims 6, 14, 18, 26, 30 and 37 were also discussed. However, no agreement was reached.

In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims 6, 18 and 30, and the dependent claims 14, 26 and 37, to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Edwards et al. and Moran et al. in accordance with the discussion of the personal interview of August 9, 2010. In addition, claims 6, 18, 30 and 33-38 have been amended to correct informalities and/or to make minor changes. As amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 6, 18 and 30, and the dependent claims 14, 26 and 37, are not obvious over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims 6-8, 10-20, 22-31 and 33-40 be allowed.

1. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 6, 18 and 20

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part "*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational*

relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by the other element of the said first and second graphic elements,” which is not disclosed in Edwards et al. or Moran et al. Consequently, the amended independent claim 6 is not obvious over
5 Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 6 be allowed.

The Office Action correctly states on page 4 that Edwards et al. “does not teach wherein a first graphic element of said additional graphic elements is displayed in said
10 display-and-control graphic element and a second graphic element of said different graphic element is displayed outside of said display-and-control graphic element, and wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element.” Thus, Edwards et al. does not teach the limitation of “*wherein
15 said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by the other element of the said first and second graphic elements,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 6.

As explained during the personal interview of August 9, 2010, the cited reference
20 of Moran et al. fails to teach the above limitation. In particular, the cited reference of Moran et al. fails to teach that the text “alter” in a freeform loop selection 70 and the text “ed” outside of the freeform loop selection 70 have a defined operational relationship
25 such that one of the two texts is controlled by the other text. That is, the cited reference of Moran et al. fails to teach that the text “alter” is controlled by the text “ed” and vice versa. Thus, Moran et al. also does not teach the limitation of “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control
30 graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by*

the other element of the said first and second graphic elements,” as recited in the amended independent claim 6.

Since neither Edwards et al. nor Moran et al. teaches the claimed limitation of
5 “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic
element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said
display-and-control graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic
elements is controlled by the other element of the said first and second graphic
elements,”* the amended independent claim 6 cannot be rendered obvious over Edwards et
10 al. in view of Moran et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended
independent claim 6 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 18 and
30, which recite similar limitations as the amended independent claim 6. Thus, Applicant
15 respectfully asserts that the amended independent claims 18 and 30 are also not obvious
over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al., and requests that these amended independent
claims 18 and 30 be allowed as well.

2. Patentability of Dependent Claims 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-29, 31 and 33-40

20 Each of the dependent claims 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-29, 31 and 33-40 depends on
one of the amended independent claims 6, 18 and 30. As such, these dependent claims
include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits
that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective
25 base claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional
reasons.

As an example, the dependent claim 14 recites in part “*a second display-and-
control graphic element on said local drawing surface of said display-and-control
30 graphic element such that said second display-and-control graphic element is located
within said display-and-control graphic element, said second display-and-control*

graphic element including a graphic element that is functionally linked with a particular graphic element, said second display-and-control graphic element having the same characteristics of said display-and-control graphic element,” which is not disclosed in Edwards et al. Fig. 17 of Edwards et al. illustrates the manual joining of two segments (See the description for Fig. 17 in the Brief Description of the Drawings section). However, Edwards et al. does not teach one segment on a surface of another segment such that one segment is located within another segment. In fact, in column 10, lines 53-65, of Edwards et al., it is described that segments are not permitted to overlap in order to ensure strokes on the display remain visible. Since Edwards et al. does not disclose the above claimed limitations, the dependent claim 14 is not obvious over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al.

The above remarks are also applicable to the dependent claims 26 and 37 since these claims recite similar limitations as the dependent claim 14.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Denny Jaeger

Date: September 27, 2010

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300